

REMARKS

The drawings were accepted by the Examiner.

Claims 4, 11, 13, 14 have been allowed.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as their invention. Claims 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hasegawa et al. (US 2004/0031962) in view of Seki (US 2003/0137242).

By this amendment, claims 15, 16, and 17 have been amended.

Claim 15 has been amended to indicate that the oxygen plasma in step a and the fluorocarbon plasma in step b are both performed at a pressure greater than 0.1 Bar. The Examiner should note that on page 14, lines 12-15 Applicants define atmospheric pressure as greater than 0.1 Bar. The Examiners attention is drawn to Example 4 on page 29 where it is clear that a fluorocarbon-bearing gas and hydrogen containing gas cause a thicker deposition of the fluorocarbon layer over the electrode than over regions adjacent to the electrodes in accordance with step b of claim 15.

Turning now to Hasegawa et al., they only have a single processing step. The mixture they use is oxygen and CF₄. Moreover, the pressure they use is 20 Pascal (0.0002 Bar) or 40 Pascal (0.0004 Bar). Applicants believe that with their mixtures and pressures, they do not provide an effective way to provide for the selective deposition (different thicknesses) as set forth in amended claim 15. (See Example 4.) Hasegawa et al. in paragraphs 87-91 state that they have a fluorine terminated surface in areas adjacent to the electrode and InF_x covered by CF_x on the ITO. As pointed out by the Examiner, Hasegawa et al. discloses that “the CF_x layer 35 is formed only over electrode 4 but not over adjacent regions comprising layer 33.” The wording of claim 15 requires that the fluorocarbon layer be formed over both the electrode and the regions adjacent to the electrode. Whether or not Hasegawa et al. are correct in their assertion, applicants believe that they do not disclose selectively formatting the layer to have different thicknesses. Applicants also believe that their gas mixture (CF₄ and oxygen) at their low pressures can not effectively selectively form a fluorocarbon layer of different thicknesses.

It is believed that Hasegawa et al. provides no motivation for the subject matter of amended claim 15. In fact, Hasegawa et al. teach away from the present invention as they do not have the selective deposition of a fluorocarbon layer.

Seki does indeed teach an oxygen treatment plasma for a surface of an ITO electrode. However, Seki's process does not have any suggestion of step b in claim 15, wherein the specified gas mixture at the specified pressure provides a fluorocarbon layer that has different thicknesses on the ITO electrode and surrounding regions. There would be no reason that one skilled in the art would read Seki and see how it could be combined with Hasegawa et al.. A fair reading of these references seems to be that they have come to different technical conclusions, namely that CF₄/oxygen plasma treatments form hydrophobic fluorocarbon layers on ITO while etching surrounding oxide in Hasegawa et al., whereas the same plasma treatments in Seki form hydrophilic fluorine-containing layers on inorganic oxides, while forming hydrophobic fluorocarbon layers on surrounding photoresist. Furthermore, neither Seki nor Hasegawa et al. suggest the use of hydrogen in the gas mixture found in step b of claim 15.

Claim 16 has been changed in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion and is now believed to be clear and definite without any inconsistencies. Claim 17 has been amended to depend from claim 15, and so the problem noted by the Examiner should be eliminated.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the invention set forth in claim 15. This claim is believed to contain allowable subject matter. The remaining rejected

claims depend upon claim 15 and should be allowed along with it. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-4653
Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.